

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the captioned application and are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (US 5,288,763) in combination with Matyjaszewski et al. (US 5,763,548). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of these claims in view of the following comments.

With regard to claim 1, while the Examiner admits “Li does not positively teach that template macromolecule can initiate a polymerization”, the Examiner insists that Li teaches “the reaction can start even without any initiator (i.e. benzoyl peroxide, column 4, line 65)”. The Examiner thus is of the opinion that the template macromolecule itself initiates a polymerization. In response, Applicants argued in the previous response that the Examiner’s assumption, i.e., template macromolecule itself initiates a polymerization, is not supported by Li.

In the current Office action, the Examiner cites Fujimori (Pol. Bull., 9:204-207(1983)) to show that poly(4-vinylpyridine) greatly increases the rate of radical polymerization. The Examiner reasons that because Li uses poly(4-vinylpyridine) as a template molecule, and Li teaches that the reaction can start even without any initiator, poly(4-vinylpyridine) can represent at least part of an initiating system. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants submit that it is generally known in the field that there are three stages at which one can increase the rate of chain polymerization: 1. at the initiation stage; 2. at the propagation step; and 3. at the termination step, i.e. by stopping whatever it is that terminates propagation. Applicants submit that Fujimori relates to (2), i.e., the propagation step, see e.g., page 204, 2nd sentence under Introduction. Fujimori also discusses (3), i.e., how the termination can be retarded, see p. 207. Applicants submit that the increased rate of polymerization in Fujimori is not connected to the initiation stage at all. The "rate enhancement" discussed of at the very last sentence of page 207 is related to propagation and retardation of the termination.

In view of the arguments above, Applicants again request reconsideration and allowance of claim 1 and dependent claims 2-19.


Claims 2, 4, 5, 8 and 9 are again rejected by a combination of Li in view of Matyjaszewski. Applicants have discussed Matyjaszewski in the previous response. Applicants submit that as discussed above, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Li. Therefore, dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 8 and 9 are not rendered obvious. None of the references teach or disclose the inclusion of a degradable initiator, which is degraded after polymerization to produce a secondary pore structure.

Appl. No. 10/517,226
Amendment dated February 11, 2008
Reply to Office action of October 9, 2007

Early and favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

GE Healthcare Bio-Sciences Corp.

By: 
Yonggang Ji
Reg. No.: 53,073
Agent for Applicants

GE Healthcare Bio-Sciences Corp.
800 Centennial Avenue
P. O. Box 1327
Piscataway, New Jersey 08855-1327

Tel: (732) 980-2875
Fax: (732) 457-8463

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being uploaded to the United States Patent and Trademark Office using the Electronic Filing System on February 11, 2008.

Signature: 

Name: Melissa Leck